

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Final Office Action of February 20, 2003, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 17, 23, 39, and 45 have been amended. Claims 1-61 remain pending. Claims 62-64 have been added.

In the specification, the paragraphs beginning at page 1, line 4, page 6, line 18, page 13, line 9, page 16, line 1, and page 17, line 15, have been amended to correct minor editorial errors. These amendments to the specification clearly do not add new matter.

Claims 62-64 have been added. Support for the added claims can be found throughout the specification and drawings.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 45-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Without acquiescing in the rejection, in order to better clarify the invention, Applicant has amended independent claim 45. Dependent claims 46-61 overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection for the same reasons as their ultimate base claim.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferris et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,418, hereinafter referred to as *Ferris*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As amended, independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 39 each recite, among other features, “selecting a predetermined region of a web page layout.” Applicant’s invention is patently distinguishable over the prior art because *Ferris* neither teaches nor suggests this feature of Applicant’s claims 1, 17, 23, and 39. Even assuming, without admitting, the Action’s contention that “[t]he title is considered as a predetermined region of the web page layout since it is well

known that a title was in the top region of a web page,” by this admission, the Action clearly states that the predetermined region is not selected. In *Ferris*, “[t]he database documents are selected based on predefined tags which are part of the templates. The documents from the database is positioned in place of the tag and the result presented as a finished product.” (col. 5, lines 53-57). As such, predetermined regions are not selected as each template is composed of predefined tag regions for insertion of database documents. Therefore, *Ferris* fails to teach or suggest, “selecting a predetermined region of a web page layout,” as recited, among other features, in Applicant’s claims 1, 17, 23, and 39.

As amended, independent claim 45 recites, among other features, “receiving a predetermined region selection signal indicative of a user interface selection device pointing at a selected predetermined region on the display.” Applicant’s invention is patently distinguishable over the prior art because *Ferris* fails to teach or suggest this feature of Applicant’s claim 45. *Ferris* describes operation of a web presenter 24 in FIG. 5. In *Ferris*, at best, a user can click only on a hyperlink. (*Ferris*, element 90). Thus, FIG. 5 and any other portion of *Ferris* fail to teach or suggest, “receiving a predetermined region selection signal indicative of a user interface selection device pointing to a selected predetermined region on the display,” as recited, among other features, in Applicant’s claim 45.

Applicant’s claims 2-16, 18-22, 24-38, 40-44, and 46-61, which depend from claims 1, 17, 23, 39, and 45, respectively, are patentably distinct over *Ferris* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

New claims 62-64 are fully supported by the specification and are believed allowable over the art of record. For example, teachings of uploading the web page layout to a server as recited, among other features, in new claims 62 and 64 cannot be found in *Ferris*.

Appl. No. 09/299,724  
Amdt. Dated May 14, 2003  
Response to Accompany Request for Continued Examination

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. No fee is believed due, however, if any fees are required or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Applicant looks forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.**

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

Date: May 14, 2003

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Eleventh Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
(202) 824-3000